From:	Jay Field
To:	Dana Davoli/R10/USEPA/US@EPA
Cc:	Benjamin Shorr; Eric Blischke/R10/USEPA/US@EPA; Robert Neely
Subject:	Re: SCRA vs. QM Data Bases
Date:	12/07/2006 11:59 AM
Attachments:	ph_hexachlorobutadiene_rep.xls

Dana,
Here's an example showing how the preferred labrep ("1") and other reps are coded in the database for a sample with different methods for the same analyte. The SCRA would presumably average the two values from the same preferred method and ignore the other reps.
Jay

Davoli.Dana@epamail.epa.gov wrote:

> Sounds good. I think it would be good idea to do some cursory checks. I
> don't think I can do much until I get QM on my computer though.....
>
> Jay Field <Jay.Field@noaa.gov> 12/07/2006 08:34 AM
> To: Dana Davoli/R10/USEPA/US@EPA
> cc: Eric Blischke/R10/USEPA/US@EPA, Robert Neely <Robert.Neely@noaa.gov>, Benjamin Shorr <Benjamin.Shorr@noaa.gov>
> Subject: Re: SCRA vs. QM Data Bases
>
> Dana,
> The database will include all non-rejected sample results. Integral
> provides us with a designation for the preferred result in the database
> when multiple results exist for the same chemical in a sample. For
> individual queries, QM selects the "preferred" replicate result for each
>
> chemical. Let me know if you need additional information. If you want
> to check to make sure that this is done correctly, I'd be glad to help
> you extract the data from QM to confirm.
> Jay
>
> Davoli.Dana@epamail.epa.gov wrote:

How will the QM handle data when we had re-analysis (e.g., for the
chlorinated pesticides) and when we have multiple results for the same
chemical in a sample?

Eric

Blischke/R10/USE

PA/US

To

anderson.jim@deq.state.or.us,

12/06/2006 04:37
jeff.baker@grandronde.org,

PM BBarquin@hk-law.com,

pbattuello@parametrix.com,

lbernardini@parametrix.com, Curt

Black/R10/USEPA/US@EPA,

jeremy_buck@fws.gov, Ben

Cope/R10/USEPA/US@EPA,

cunninghame@gorge.net, Dana

Davoli/R10/USEPA/US@EPA,

Rene tomd@ctsi.nsn.us,

Fuentes/R10/USEPA/US@EPA, GAINER

Tom

<GAINER.Tom@deq.state.or.us>,

rgensemer@parametrix.com,

Ron.Gouguet@noaa.gov, Joe

Goulet/R10/USEPA/US@EPA, Gina

Grepo-

Grove/R10/USEPA/US@EPA,

howp@critfc.org,

audiehuber@ctuir.com, Chip Humphrey/R10/USEPA/US@EPA, Kristine Koch/R10/USEPA/US@EPA, rose@yakama.com, erin.madden@gmail.com, Robert.Neely@noaa.gov, Sean Sheldrake/R10/USEPA/US@EPA, Burt Shephard/R10/USEPA/US@EPA, Jennifer L Peterson <PETERSON.Jenn@deq.state.or.us>, POULSEN Mike <POULSEN.Mike@deq.state.or.us>,

jay.field@noaa.gov,

jennifer.arthur@EILTD.net,

chris.thompson@EILTD.net,

MCCLINCY Matt

<MCCLINCY.Matt@deq.state.or.us>,

aron.borok@EILTD.net, Lori

Cora/R10/USEPA/US,

Mark

Ader/R10/USEPA/US@EPA,

cinde.donoghue@eiltd.net,

Benjamin Shorr

<Benjamin.Shorr@noaa.gov>,

csmith@parametrix.com

cc

Subject

SCRA vs. QM Data Bases

As promised, I spoke to Jay Field regarding the differences between

the

SCRA and QM data bases.

The QM data base was developed as a national data base and conforms to
national rules developed by NOAA, The SCRA data base incorporates

site

specific rules developed by the LWG and in most cases, approved by

EPA.

Overall, the differences in the two data bases are expected to be

minor.

The key differences are the treatment of replicates and the summation
rules for chemicals such as PAHs.

Regarding replicates, QM treats all lab duplicates, field splits and
field replicates as individual samples. The SCRA data base averages
field splits (one sample is homogenized in the field and split into

two

samples) and lab duplicates (one sample is split by the lab into two analyses). Field replicates are treated as individual samples in both the SCRA and QM data bases.

For non-detect values. NOAA typically excludes non-detect values from sums. The SCRA applies rules based on whether the compound is

expected

to be present.

Summation rules may be different. LWG summed chemicals such as PAHs according to rules approved for RI/FS. NOAA has own rules that are applied for national data base. These rules are applied when data is put into QM. We will try to look at the difference that this makes. The concept is to take the summed values from the SCRA data base and incorporate into QM as a specific record (as opposed to a calculated sum). However, this step is not considered time critical for the exploratory analysis. However, on a parallel path, Jay will look at steps necessary to add summed values as record from SCRA into QM data base as its own record. We will begin this process but may not be completed in time for pre-Round 2 Data evaluation.

Because differences between the SCRA and QM data bases are expected to be minor, for the building the water data base, we will just use the SCRA.

See my earlier email that includes the various data reduction and summation rules for additional information. Also, please note that during the framework discussions, we reached general agreement on the application of summation rules. This is described in the October 19, 2006 LWG response to the issue summary table.

Jay, please add anything I may have overlooked or misstated.

If you have any questions, please let me or Jay know.

Thanks, Eric

--
Jay Field
Coastal Protection and Restoration Division

Office of Response and Restoration, NOAA
7600 Sand Point Way NE
Seattle, WA 98115-6349
(P) 206-526-6404
(F) 206-526-6865
(E) jay.field@noaa.gov

--
Jay Field
Coastal Protection and Restoration Division
Office of Response and Restoration, NOAA
7600 Sand Point Way NE
Seattle, WA 98115-6349
(P) 206-526-6404
(F) 206-526-6865
(E) jay.field@noaa.gov